

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/719,671	Applicant(s) COLLINS ET AL.	
	Examiner Ruth C. Rodriguez	Art Unit 3677	

All Participants:

(1) Ruth C. Rodriguez, PTO.

(2) Tedd R. Rittmaster, applicant's representative.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 June 2005

Time: 3:30 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

16, 44 and 66-71

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Mr. Rittmaster to propose an Examiner's amendment for claims 16 and 44. The Examiner indicated that claims 16 and 44 fail to recite the locking mechanism that keeps the first foot connected to the portable device. The Examiner proposed the insertion of the limitation "wherein the first foot has a locking mechanism for securing the clip to the personal device". Mr. Rittmaster called the Examiner to indicate that the Applicant accepted this change. During this conversation, both parties agreed to add claims 66 to 71 that will contain the same limitations as claims 21-26 that were previously canceled as being directed to a non-elected species since claim 16 is generic to the two claimed species. Both parties agreed to made these changes through an Examiner's amendment in order to place the application in condition for allowance..